



Syllabus
HPM 969: Program Planning
Summer 2019
1 Credit | Online

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Table of Contents | 3 |
| Course Overview | 3 |
| Course Description | 3 |
| Prerequisites | 3 |
| Instructor(s) | 3 |
| Teaching Assistant | 3 |
| Course Website | 3 |
| Class Days, Times, Location | 3 |
| Office Hours | 3 |
| Course Texts | 3 |
| Course Format | 3 |
| Course Policies and Resources | 4 |
| Recognizing, Valuing and Encouraging Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom | 4 |
| Accessibility | 5 |
| UNC Honor Code | 5 |
| Instructor Expectations | 5 |
| Student Expectations | 6 |
| Competencies, Learning Objectives, and Assessment | 8 |
| Map | 8 |
| Course Assignments and Assessments | 9 |
| Grading Scale | 9 |
| Assignment Descriptions | 9 |
| 1. Concept Proposal (15%) | 9 |
| 2. Concept Proposal – Section #1 (15%) | 10 |
| 3. Concept Proposal – Section #2 (15%) | 10 |
| 4. Concept Proposal – Section #3 (15%) | 10 |
| 5. Peer Appraisal (15%) | 10 |
| 6. Concept Proposal Elevator Pitch (10%) | 10 |
| 7. Participation (15%) | 10 |
| Course-at-a-Glance | 11 |
| Course Schedule | 12 |
| TBD (Session 1): Basic Approaches to Program Planning | 12 |
| TBD (Session 2): Logic Models and Stakeholders | 12 |
| TBD (Session 3): Evidence-Based Interventions and Innovations | 13 |
| TBD (Session 4): Curation and Editing | 13 |
| TBD (Session 5): Elevator Pitches | 14 |

Appendix: Rubrics..... 15

Course Overview

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Course Description | The course focuses on approaches to plan programs that promote individual and community health. The course is anchored in the Intervention Mapping approach. Students will develop an understanding of the essential steps in the program planning process: needs assessments, establishing program goals and objectives, and selecting and developing program strategies. |
| Prerequisites | This course is restricted to DrPH Executive Doctoral Students in Health Leadership. No other prerequisites are required. |
| Instructor(s) | Leah Frerichs, PhD Assistant Professor Department of Health Policy & Management 1102C McGavran-Greenberg Phone: 919-966-7375 Email: leahf@email.unc.edu |
| Teaching Assistant | None |
| Course Website | https://sakai.unc.edu/welcome/ . Use your ONYEN and password. |
| Class Days, Times, Location | This course is a combination of residential and online. The class meets online on various Tuesday evenings throughout the semester. The class schedule is listed below. |
| Office Hours | There are no set office hours for this course. Students may request an appointment by email. Virtual office hours may be conducted via phone, Skype, or Zoom. |
| Course Texts | There is no required textbook. Readings will be noted in the Course Schedule. |
| Course Format | The course format will include short weekly lectures in class that are supplemented with small group discussions, in-class exercises, case studies, and examples from the public health literature. Students are expected to complete the readings before class and come to each class prepared to discuss the texts. |

Course Policies and Resources

Recognizing, Valuing and Encouraging Inclusion and Diversity in the Classroom

We share the School's [commitment to diversity](#). We are committed to ensuring that the School is a diverse, inclusive, civil and welcoming community. Diversity and inclusion are central to our mission — to improve public health, promote individual well-being and eliminate health inequities across North Carolina and around the world. Diversity and inclusion are assets that contribute to our strength, excellence and individual and institutional success. We welcome, value and learn from individual differences and perspectives. These include but are not limited to: cultural and racial/ethnic background; country of origin; gender; age; socioeconomic status; physical and learning abilities; physical appearance; religion; political perspective; sexual identity and veteran status. Diversity, inclusiveness and civility are core values we hold, as well as characteristics of the School that we intend to strengthen.

We are committed to expanding diversity and inclusiveness across the School— among faculty, staff, students, on advisory groups, and in our curricula, leadership, policies and practices. We measure diversity and inclusion not only in numbers, but also by the extent to which students, alumni, faculty and staff members perceive the School's environment as welcoming, valuing all individuals and supporting their development.”

In this class, we practice these commitments in the following ways:

- Develop classroom participation approaches that acknowledge the diversity of ways of contributing in the classroom and foster participation and engagement of *all* students.
- Structure assessment approaches that acknowledge different methods for acquiring knowledge and demonstrating proficiency.
- Encourage and solicit feedback from students to continually improve inclusive practices.

As a student in the class, you are also expected to understand and uphold the following UNC policies:

- **Diversity and Inclusion at the Gillings School of Global Public Health:**
<http://sph.unc.edu/resource-pages/diversity/>
- **UNC Non-Discrimination Policies:**
<http://policy.sites.unc.edu/files/2013/04/nondiscrim.pdf>
- **Prohibited Discrimination, Harassment, and Related Misconduct at UNC:**
<https://deanofstudents.unc.edu/incident-reporting/prohibited-harassmentsexual-misconduct>

Accessibility

UNC-CH supports all reasonable accommodations, including resources and services, for students with disabilities, chronic medical conditions, a temporary disability, or a pregnancy complication resulting in difficulties with accessing learning opportunities. All accommodations are coordinated through the UNC Office of Accessibility Resources & Services (ARS), <https://ars.unc.edu/>; phone 919-962-8300; email ars@unc.edu. Students must document/register their need for accommodations with ARS before accommodations can be implemented.

UNC Honor Code

As a student at UNC-Chapel Hill, you are bound by the university's [Honor Code](#), through which UNC maintains standards of academic excellence and community values. It is your responsibility to learn about and abide by the code. All written assignments or presentations (including team projects) should be completed in a manner that demonstrates academic integrity and excellence. Work should be completed in your own words, but your ideas should be supported with well-cited evidence and theory. To ensure effective functioning of the [Honor System](#) at UNC, students are expected to:

- a. Conduct all academic work within the letter and spirit of the Honor Code, which prohibits the giving or receiving of unauthorized aid in all academic processes.
- b. Learn the recognized techniques of proper attribution of sources used in written work; and to identify allowable resource materials or aids to be used during completion of any graded work.
- c. **Sign a pledge on all graded academic work certifying that no unauthorized assistance has been received or given in the completion of the work.**
- d. Report any instance in which reasonable grounds exist to believe that a fellow student has violated the Honor Code.

Instructors are required to report suspected violations of the Honor Code, including inappropriate collaborative work or problematic use of secondary materials, to the Honor Court. Honor Court sanctions can include receiving a zero for the assignment, failing the course and/or suspension from the university. If you have any questions about [your rights and responsibilities](#), please consult the Office of Student Conduct at <https://studentconduct.unc.edu/>, or consult these other resources:

- Honor system [module](#).
- UNC library's [plagiarism tutorial](#).
- UNC Writing Center [handout on plagiarism](#).

Instructor Expectations

Email

The instructor will typically respond to email within 48 hours or less if sent Monday through Friday. The instructor may respond to weekend emails, but it is not required of them. If you receive an out of office reply when emailing, it may

take longer to receive a reply. The instructor will provide advance notice, if possible, when they will be out of the office.

Feedback All graded assignments will receive written feedback that coincides with the assessment rubric. Feedback is meant to be constructive and help the student continue to build upon their skills. The types of feedback you may receive are descriptive feedback, evaluative feedback, and motivational feedback. Feedback is a tool that you as a learner can use to understand the areas that you are succeeding in and what you can do to improve in other areas.

Grading Assignments and projects will be graded no more than two weeks after the due date. Assignments that build on the next assignment will be graded within one week of the final due date. Early submissions will not be graded before the final due date.

Syllabus Changes The instructor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus, including project due dates and test dates. These changes will be announced as early as possible.

Telephone Messages The instructor will respond to telephone messages within 48 hours Monday through Thursday. Calls left on a Friday will be returned that day if possible; if not, they will be returned by Tuesday.

Student Expectations

Appropriate Use of Course Resources: The materials used in this class, including, but not limited to, syllabus and assignments are copyright protected works. Any unauthorized copying of the class materials is a violation of federal law and may result in disciplinary actions being taken against the student. Additionally, the sharing of class materials without the specific, express approval of the instructor may be a violation of the University's Student Honor Code and an act of academic dishonesty, which could result in further disciplinary action. This includes, among other things, uploading class materials to websites for the purpose of sharing those materials with other current or future students.

Assignments Submit assignments through Sakai or peergrade (as instructed). Emailing assignments is not acceptable unless prior arrangements have been made. If you are having issues submitting assignments, try a different web browser first. If switching browsers does not work, email or call the instructor for guidance.

Peergrade Students will use Peergrade (<https://www.peergrade.io/>) to submit and peer review their classmate's concept proposal sections throughout the course. The instructor will also provide feedback via the peergrade platform. Students will receive an invitation to the course via their UNC email and will need to create an account.

Attendance/ Participation Your attendance and active participation are an integral part of your learning experience in this course. If you are unavoidably absent, please notify the course instructor.

- Communication** You are expected to follow common courtesy in all communication to include email, discussion boards, and face-to-face. All electronic communications sent should follow proper English grammar rules to include complete sentences. This is a professional course, and you are expected to communicate as a professional.
- Contributions** You are expected to offer individual contributions in class and on individual assignments, and collaborate with fellow students on assignments for which students may work together, such as group assignments.
- Email** All email correspondence between student/instructor and peer/peer will be conducted in a professional manner following email etiquette.
- View the following link for more information on email etiquette:
<http://metropolitanorganizing.com/etiquette-professional-organizing-services/essential-email-etiquette-tips/>
- Late Work** All assignments are due at time/dates specified in this syllabus and corresponding schedule on Sakai. Late assignments may or may not be accepted. They will likely be accepted in the case of unforeseen and distressing events (serious illness, a death in the family). Please notify the instructor immediately should one of these events arise. The instructor may also accept late assignments for other reasons, but reserves the right to penalize points at her discretion.
- Readings** Readings for a particular class should be completed before the class session and before completing associated activities
- Technical support** The UNC Information Technology Services (ITS) department provides technical support 24-hours per day, seven days per week. If you need computer help, please contact the ITS Help Desk by phone at +1-919-962-HELP (919-962-4357), or by email at help@unc.edu, or by visiting their website at <http://help.unc.edu>, or by UNC Live Chat at <http://its.unc.edu/itrc/chat>.

Competencies, Learning Objectives, and Assessment

Map

Competencies taught in this course, learning objectives mapped to these competencies, and assignments that assess attainment of these competencies.

| Competency | Learning Objectives | Assessment Assignment |
|---|--|--|
| DrPH 4. Propose strategies for health improvement and elimination of health inequities by organizing stakeholders, including researchers, practitioners, community leaders and other partners | 1. List and explain basic steps of established and novel public health program planning approaches 2. Formulate an argument about the importance and need for a specific public health program 3. Formulate goals, objectives, and logic models for public health programs 4. Describe and use sources for identifying potential theory- and evidence-based strategies 5. Apply tools that are useful for generating novel and creative public health program strategies | Section #1 of Concept Proposal Section #2 of Concept Proposal |
| DrPH 6. Integrate knowledge, approaches, methods, values and potential contributions from multiple professions and systems in addressing public health programs | 6. Analyze potential stakeholders and partners for public health programs | Section #2 of Concept Proposal |
| DrPH 15. Integrate knowledge of cultural values and practices in the design of public health policies and programs | 7. Discuss how context (social, cultural, political, physical) can influence implementation and outcomes of public health programs 8. Compare the costs and benefits of different public health programs | Section #2 of Concept Proposal Section #3 of Concept Proposal |
| DrPH 14. Design a system-level intervention to address a public health issue | 9. Design and defend a public health program | Elevator Pitch and Final Concept Proposal |

Course Assignments and Assessments

This course will include graded assignments and/or exams.

| Assignments | Points/Percentages |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Peer Appraisal | 15 |
| 2. Concept Proposal – Section 1 | 15 |
| 3. Concept Proposal – Section 2 | 15 |
| 4. Concept Proposal – Section 3 | 15 |
| 5. Final Concept Proposal | 15 |
| 6. Final Concept Proposal Elevator Pitch | 10 |
| 7. Participation | 15 |
| TOTAL | 100 |

Grading Scale

Final course grades will be determined using the following [UNC Graduate School grading scale](#). The relative weight of each course component is shown in the table above.

| | | |
|----------|-----------------------------|--|
| H | Greater than or equal to 92 | High Pass: Clearly excellent graduate work |
| P | 75 to 91 | Pass: Entirely satisfactory graduate work |
| L | 60 to 74 | Low Pass: Inadequate graduate work |
| F | Below 60 | Fail |

Assignment Descriptions

Descriptions of the assignments follow.

1. Concept Proposal (15%)

Each student will complete a concept proposal for a program that addresses a public health need/issue of interest to them. The purpose of the concept proposal is to attract the interest of potential funders. The intent is to stimulate their interest to a level where they would encourage you to conduct more detailed investigation and planning for your program. The potential funders will need to see evidence that you have thought through the initial stages of your idea. You do not need to provide specific operational and financial details, but you must convey that your ‘program’ will fill an important need, has high potential for success, and is worthy of their investment.

Students will complete the concept proposal in three sections throughout the semester (described in more detail in the following sections), receiving both peer and instructor feedback on each section. Students will use Peergrade (<https://www.peergrade.io/>) to submit the concept proposal sections and provide peer feedback. At the end of the course, the student will submit a final concept proposal (maximum of 4 pages not including references, single spaced, 1-inch margins, 11-12 point font) via Sakai.

The intent is that you could use the concept proposal in your professional work, so choose a relevant topic to your current endeavors or one that you wish to pursue. General page recommendations for each section are provided; however, these are suggestions and not requirements. Tables and figures are encouraged to communicate your ideas.

2. Concept Proposal – Section #1 (15%)

In the first section, describe the following:

Program Significance: Provide supporting documentation about the importance of addressing the question, problem, or need that your program will address. If you have data, use it. Convince the potential funder that you are an expert in this particular issue and more needs to be done. (0.5-1 page)

3. Concept Proposal – Section #2 (15%)

In the second section, describe the following:

Program Description: Briefly describe your goals and objectives. Provide an overview of the methods/strategies that the program will use. Cite and refer to what others have accomplished with other public health programs. Describe how your program will use or build upon existing evidence-based strategies and highlight any innovative approaches, techniques, or processes. (0.5-1.5 pages)

Partnership Alignment: Demonstrate that you understand the mission of the potential funding agency and clearly identify how your program idea aligns and will serve the agency's mission. Also describe potential partner agencies and stakeholders that will be involved, their interests, power, and roles in your specific proposed program. (0.25-1 page)

4. Concept Proposal – Section #3 (15%)

In the third section, describe the following:

Anticipated Costs and Timelines: You do not need to have detailed budgets with line item justifications, but you should be able to describe the types of support you will need (e.g., personnel, travel, equipment), and rough estimates of total costs. You should also outline general timelines for what you hope to accomplish. (0.25-.75 page)

Value proposition: Describe the anticipated types and extent of benefits (e.g., monetary, cost, time) and who will receive those benefits. Be thoughtful about not only how patients/consumers may benefit, but the potential benefits to the funding agency. (0.25-0.75 page)

5. Peer Appraisal (15%)

Students will be required to provide peer feedback on each other's concept proposal sections using Peergrade (<https://www.peergrade.io/>). Students will be required to upload each of their sections of the concept proposal into Peergrade by the assigned deadlines. Students will then be required to provide 3 peers feedback using the rubric provided within Peergrade. Peergrade will randomly distribute work between students. Each student's peer reviews will be graded for quality, accuracy, and usefulness of feedback provided.

6. Concept Proposal Elevator Pitch (10%)

During the final in-person session, students will also present a short (3-minute) elevator pitch of their proposed program. The pitch should be targeted to potential funders and provide a compelling reason why the funder should be interested in your program and a concise overview of your potential program.

7. Participation (15%)

In order to have successful learning experiences, your active participation is required in class discussions and the in-class exercises/activities. You will need to make certain that you have prepared thoroughly for the activities, have all necessary materials, and come prepared with thoughtful questions (questions of clarification on difficult points are considered thoughtful). Lecture slides and other supporting materials will be available from the course website. You should have access to the readings at least one full week before the day they will be discussed. Some weeks there will also be videos for you to watch prior to class. You also are encouraged to bring to the attention of the instructor and course colleagues relevant items of interest. Attendance is important and required; therefore, please make certain that you notify the instructor if you will miss a session.

Course-at-a-Glance

The instructor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus, including project due dates and test dates. These changes will be announced as early as possible.

| Date/Session/Week/Unit | Topic and Competency | Assignment Due |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Session #1 | Topic: Basic approaches to program planning | Section #1 of Concept Proposal Three peer reviews completed |
| Session #2 | Topic: Logic Models & Stakeholders | Nothing due for your concept proposal; however, it is recommended that you begin work on Section #2 of your concept proposal. |
| Session #3 | Topic: Evidence-Based Interventions & Innovations | Section #2 of your concept proposal Three peer reviews completed |
| Session #4 | Topic: Curation & Editing | Section #2 of your concept proposal Three peer reviews completed |
| Session #5 | Topic: Elevator Pitches | Final Concept Proposal and Elevator Pitch |

Course Schedule

The instructor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus, including project due dates and test dates. These changes will be announced as early as possible.

TBD (Session 1): Basic Approaches to Program Planning

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Session 1 | |
| Topic | Basic approaches to program planning |
| Competency Addressed | DrPH 4. Propose strategies for health improvement and elimination of health inequities by organizing stakeholders, including researchers, practitioners, community leaders and other partners |
| Learning Objective(s) | 1a: List and explain basic steps of established and novel public health program planning approaches 1b: Formulate an argument about the importance and need for a potential public health program |
| Required Readings | -Overview of intervention mapping p. 3-49 in Bartholomew, L. K., Parcel, G. S., & Kok, G. (2011). Planning Health Promotion Programs An Intervention Mapping Approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. -Liedtka, J., & Ogilvie, T. (2011). Four Questions, Ten Tools (Chapter Two) in Liedtka, J., & Ogilvie, T. Designing for growth (pp.102-120). New York. Designing for growth. New York: Columbia University Press. |
| Assignments/Deadlines | Section #1 of your concept proposal due June 6 th (via peergrade) Peer Reviews of 3 of your classmate's concept proposal sections due June 12 th (via peergrade) |

TBD (Session 2): Logic Models and Stakeholders

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Session 2 | |
| Topic | Logic Models & Stakeholders |
| Competency Addressed | DrPH 4. Propose strategies for health improvement and elimination of health inequities by organizing stakeholders, including researchers, practitioners, community leaders and other partners |
| Learning Objective(s) | 2a. Formulate goals, objectives, and logic models for public health programs 2b. Analyze potential stakeholders and partners for public health programs |
| Required Readings | Alvarez, S., Douthwaite, B., Thiele, G., Mackay, R., Córdoba, D., & Tehelen, K. (2010). Participatory impact pathways analysis: a practical method for project planning and evaluation. Development in Practice, 20(8), 946-958 |
| Other Required Resources | Watch before class: Logic Models in Public Health: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IHep0gJRTwI |
| Assignments/Deadlines | Nothing due for your concept proposal; however, it is recommended that you begin work on Section #2 of your concept proposal. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Conduct at least one stakeholder interview on potential public health program strategies. The stakeholder can include potential end users/consumers, individuals involved in implementation, politically important individuals relevant to the program. We will discuss your interviews during session #3. |
|--|--|

TBD (Session 3): Evidence-Based Interventions and Innovations

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Session 3 | |
| Topic | Evidence-Based Interventions & Innovations |
| Competency Addressed | DrPH 4: Propose strategies for health improvement and elimination of health inequities by organizing stakeholders, including researchers, practitioners, community leaders and other partners DrPH 6: Integrate knowledge, approaches, methods, values and potential contributions from multiple professions and systems in addressing public health programs |
| Learning Objective(s) | 3a: Describe and use sources for identifying potential theory- and evidence-based strategies 3b: Apply tools that are useful for generating novel and creative public health program strategies |
| Required Readings | -Cairney, P., & Oliver, K. (2017). Evidence-based policymaking is not like evidence-based medicine, so how far should you go to bridge the divide between evidence and policy?. <i>Health research policy and systems</i> , 15(1), 35. -Brownson, R. C., Fielding, J. E., & Maylahn, C. M. (2009). Evidence-based public health: a fundamental concept for public health practice. <i>Annual review of public health</i> , 30, 175-201. |
| Other Required Resources | Watch before class: Everything is a remix Part 3: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wq5D43qAsVg Brainstorming with mind maps in a group: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O0IEj2d-ipE Six creative ways to brainstorm ideas: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yAidvTKX6xM |
| Assignments/Deadlines | Section #2 of your concept proposal due July 25 th (via peergrade) Peer Reviews of 3 of your classmate's concept proposal sections due July 31 st (via peergrade) |

TBD (Session 4): Curation and Editing

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Session 4 | |
| Topic | Curation and Editing |
| Competency Addressed | DrPH 6: Integrate knowledge, approaches, methods, values and potential contributions from multiple professions and systems in addressing public health programs |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | DrPH 15: Integrate knowledge of cultural values and practices in the design of public health policies and programs |
| Learning Objective(s) | Session 4a: Discuss how context (social, cultural, political, physical) can influence implementation and outcomes of public health programs Session 4b: Compare the costs and benefits of different public health programs |
| Required Readings | Tromp, N., & Baltussen, R. (2012). Mapping of multiple criteria for priority setting of health interventions: an aid for decision makers. BMC health services research, 12(1), 454. |
| Other Required Resources | Review before class: Washington State Institute for Public Policy: http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ |
| Assignments/Deadlines | Section #3 of your concept proposal due August 8 th (via peergrade) Peer Reviews of 3 of your classmate's concept proposal sections due August 15 th (via peergrade) |

TBD (Session 5): Elevator Pitches

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Session 5 | |
| Topic | Elevator Pitches |
| Competency Addressed | DrPH 14: Design a system-level intervention to address a public health issue |
| Learning Objective(s) | Design and defend a public health program |
| Required Readings | None |
| Class Activity | Students will provide a 3-minute elevator pitch of their concept proposal during class |
| Assignments/Deadlines | Submit your final concept proposal (all sections revised with peer and instructor feedback) via sakai |

Appendix: Rubrics

Assignment Rubric: Concept Proposal (15%)

| Competency Criteria | Met | | Partially Met | Not Met | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Exemplary (5) | Good (4) | Average (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
| 1. Significance | Presents significance of the issue to be addressed in the form of a well-structured, logical argument that is clearly compelling | Shows good effort to present the significance of the issue to be addressed in a well-structured argument, logical argument | Shows some effort to present the significance of the issue to be addressed in the form of a structured argument that is mostly clear | Presents significance of the issue to be addressed in the form structured argument, but there are several gaps or areas of confusion | Presents significance of the issue to be addressed in the form of a weak, unstructured argument |
| 2. Program Goals/Objectives | The goals of the proposed program are clear. Objectives are SMART (i.e., specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound). | The goals of the proposed program are clear. Objectives are mostly SMART, but could use some improvement. | The goals of the proposed program are mostly clear. Objectives meet some but not all criteria for being SMART. | The goals of the proposal program are mostly unclear. Some attempt made at SMART objectives, but need considerable improvement. | The goals of the proposed program are unclear. No metrics are provided to measure goals. |
| 3. Program Methods/Strategies | Provides a clear explanation of the proposed approach that is not only well-supported by evidence but also shows innovation. The program has potential to produce systemic change. | Provides an adequate explanation of the proposed approach with mostly complete supporting evidence and indication of innovation. | Provides an adequate explanation of proposed approach with some supporting evidence or indication of innovation, but more information is needed. | Provides a less than organized explanation of the proposed approach and there is little supporting evidence or indication of innovation. | Provides an unorganized and unjustified explanation of the proposed approach. |
| 4. Funding Agency Alignment | Provides a clear and compelling description how the proposed program aligns with the potential funding | Provides a clear description of how the proposed program aligns with the potential funding agency's goals/mission, | Provides a mostly clear description of how the proposed program aligns with the potential funding | Attempt is made to describe how the program relates to the potential funding agency's goals/mission, but is not clear or weak description. | Unclear how the proposed program relates to the potential funding agency's goals/mission. |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | agency's goals/mission. | but argument could be stronger. | agency's goals/mission. | | |
| 5. Partnership/ Collaboration | Proposal includes a well-defined plan identifying appropriate collaborative partners, each of which add value to the program | Proposal indicates appropriate collaborative partners but a few may be missing and more information may be required to justify partners. | Proposal shows some indication of appropriate collaborative partners. | Some project partner/s are identified, but contributions are mostly unclear | Critical project partner/s are missing from the project plans or at least one collaborative partner's contribution to the project is unclear. |
| 6. Budget/Costs | Anticipated total costs are estimated and appear complete and reasonable. Types of program costs are identified and clearly linked to the program. | Anticipated total costs are estimated and are complete and reasonable. Types of program costs are identified. | Anticipated total costs are estimated and appear mostly complete and reasonable. A few types of program costs are identified, but could be better specified. | Anticipated total costs are estimated but are clearly under/overestimated. Types of program costs are missing or vaguely identified. | Anticipated total costs and/or types of program costs are not identified, very unclear, or vague. |
| 7. Timeline | A timeline is provided and clearly appropriate. There are clear and actionable steps that are convincing. There is a strong likelihood that the all objectives will be met in the timeline. | A timeline is provided. There are actionable steps that are appropriate. It is likely all objectives will be met in the timeline provided. | A timeline is provided. There are some actionable steps that seem appropriate, but some steps appear to be missing. | A timeline is provided and it may be appropriate but clear actionable steps are not well-defined within the timeline. | No timeline is identified or is clearly inappropriate for the proposed program. |
| 8. Value Proposition | The information and data presented build a compelling case that the proposed program has potential to produce | There is information and data presented that the proposed program will produce has potential to produce benefits for | There is information and data presented that the proposed program will produce some benefits. However, potential | There is some information provided about the potential benefits, but most are unfounded, unclear, or ill-defined. | There is little information provided to build a case that the proposed program will produce any benefit. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| | benefits for many stakeholders (individuals, funding organization, partner agency, local economies, etc.) | several stakeholders. | benefits for some stakeholders appear missing or some benefits are unfounded or unconvincing. | | |
| 9. Overall writing technique | Uses acceptable style and grammar, almost no errors | Uses above average acceptable style and grammar, a few errors that are not easily noticeable | Uses adequate style and grammar, a few noticeable errors | Uses less than adequate style and grammar with several errors | Fails to use acceptable style and grammar – needs considerable proofing/editing |
| 10. Overall structure/organization | Overall provides strong, clear, convincing arguments and conclusions, i.e. relevant examples, visualizations, data are used to support arguments. The organization/flow of the proposal is clear and easy-to-follow | Provides arguments and conclusions that are relatively strong, but additional evidence and examples would improve the proposal. The organization/flow is mostly adequate. | Provides arguments and conclusions that are adequate, but some of the evidence and examples are weak or additional evidence or re-organization would improve the proposal. The organization/flow is adequate but at times difficult to follow. | Some attempt is made to organize and provide arguments and conclusions, but considerable work is needed to support the arguments and better organize the information | Overall no arguments or conclusions are well-articulated and the structure is difficult to follow |

Assignment Rubric: Concept Proposal Section #1 (15%)

| Competency Criteria | Met | | Partially Met | Not Met | |
|------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| | Exemplary (5) | Good (4) | Average (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
| 1. Significance | Presents significance of the issue to be addressed in the form of a well-structured, | Shows good effort to present the significance of the issue to be addressed in a well- | Shows some effort to present the significance of the issue to be addressed in the | Presents significance of the issue to be addressed in the form structured | Presents significance of the issue to be addressed in the form of a weak, |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| | logical argument that is clearly compelling | structured argument, logical argument | form of a structured argument that is mostly clear | argument, but there are several gaps or areas of confusion | unstructured argument |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|

Assignment Rubric: Concept Proposal Section #2 (15%)

| Competency Criteria | Met | | Partially Met | Not Met | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Points | Exemplary (5) | Good (4) | Average (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
| 2. Program Goals/Objectives | The goals of the proposed program are clear. Objectives are SMART (i.e., specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound). | The goals of the proposed program are clear. Objectives are mostly SMART, but could use some improvement. | The goals of the proposed program are mostly clear. Objectives meet some but not all criteria for being SMART. | The goals of the proposal program are mostly unclear. Some attempt made at SMART objectives, but need considerable improvement. | The goals of the proposed program are unclear. No metrics are provided to measure goals. |
| 3. Program Methods/Strategies | Provides a clear explanation of the proposed approach that is not only well-supported by evidence but also shows innovation. The program has potential to produce systemic change. | Provides an adequate explanation of the proposed approach with mostly complete supporting evidence and indication of innovation. | Provides an adequate explanation of proposed approach with some supporting evidence or indication of innovation, but more information is needed. | Provides a less than organized explanation of the proposed approach and there is little supporting evidence or indication of innovation. | Provides an unorganized and unjustified explanation of the proposed approach. |
| 4. Funding Agency Alignment | Provides a clear and compelling description how the proposed program aligns with the potential funding agency's goals/mission. | Provides a clear description of how the proposed program aligns with the potential funding agency's goals/mission, but argument could be stronger. | Provides a mostly clear description of how the proposed program aligns with the potential funding agency's goals/mission. | Attempt is made to describe how the program relates to the potential funding agency's goals/mission, but is not clear or weak description. | Unclear how the proposed program relates to the potential funding agency's goals/mission. |
| 5. Partnership/Collaboration | Proposal includes a well- | Proposal indicates | Proposal shows some indication | Some project partner/s are | Critical project partner/s are |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | defined plan identifying appropriate collaborative partners, each of which add value to the program | appropriate collaborative partners but a few may be missing and more information may be required to justify partners. | of appropriate collaborative partners. | identified, but contributions are mostly unclear | missing from the project plans or at least one collaborative partner's contribution to the project is unclear. |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|

Assignment Rubric: Concept Proposal Section #3 (15%)

| Competency Criteria | Met | | Partially Met | Not Met | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Exemplary (5) | Good (4) | Average (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
| 6. Budget/Costs | Anticipated total costs are estimated and appear complete and reasonable. Types of program costs are identified and clearly linked to the program. | Anticipated total costs are estimated and are complete and reasonable. Types of program costs are identified. | Anticipated total costs are estimated and appear mostly complete and reasonable. A few types of program costs are identified, but could be better specified. | Anticipated total costs are estimated but are clearly under/overestimated. Types of program costs are missing or vaguely identified. | Anticipated total costs and/or types of program costs are not identified, very unclear, or vague. |
| 7. Timeline | A timeline is provided and clearly appropriate. There are clear and actionable steps that are convincing. There is a strong likelihood that the all objectives will be met in the timeline. | A timeline is provided. There are actionable steps that are appropriate. It is likely all objectives will be met in the timeline provided. | A timeline is provided. There are some actionable steps that seem appropriate, but some steps appear to be missing. | A timeline is provided and it may be appropriate but clear actionable steps are not well-defined within the timeline. | No timeline is identified or is clearly inappropriate for the proposed program. |
| 8. Value Proposition | The information and data presented build a compelling case that the proposed | There is information and data presented that the proposed program will produce has potential to | There is information and data presented that the proposed program will produce some benefits. | There is some information provided about the potential benefits, but most are unfounded, unclear, or ill-defined. | There is little information provided to build a case that the proposed program will produce any benefit. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | program has potential to produce benefits for many stakeholders (individuals, funding organization, partner agency, local economies, etc.) | produce benefits for several stakeholders. | However, potential benefits for some stakeholders appear missing or some benefits are unfounded or unconvincing. | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Assignment Rubric. Elevator Pitch (10%)

| Competency Criteria | Met | Partially Met | Not Met |
|--|---|---|---|
| Points | Exemplary (3) | Good (2) | Poor (1) |
| 1. Hook | Outstanding relevance and creativity. The proposed program is memorable. | Demonstrated relevance and possibly creativity. | Minimal relevance and/or gimmicky |
| 2. Program Purpose and Approach | Describes the proposed approach and goals in a clear and compelling manner. There are clearly well-thought out ideas for this program that should be further pursued. | Describes the proposed approach and goals in a mostly clear fashion. There are possibly some ideas for this program to consider further, but presentation could be improved | The proposed approach and goals are unclear and/or obviously unrealistic. There are little to no ideas worth considering further. |
| 3. Cost/Value Proposition | Demonstrates alignment with funding agency and clearly identifies substantial benefits of the proposed program for reasonable costs. | Demonstrates alignment with the funding agency but benefits are either underwhelming and/or costs appear unrealistic. | Fails to demonstrate alignment with the funding agency and benefits are unclear and/or potential costs are not identified. |
| 4. General Presentation | Speech looks rehearsed and eye contact is maintained with the audience. | Speech looks somewhat rehearsed and eye contact is mostly maintained | Speech is clearly not rehearsed and eye contact is poor |
| 5. Timing | Within the time limit or over/under within 30 seconds. | Goes over or under within a minute. | Goes over a minute under/over the time limit (if over, had to be cut-off without completing) |